



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/783,889	02/14/2001	Srinivasan Ramachandran	TI-22697/TXN-0003	3395
23494	7590	08/18/2004	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			TRAN, DOUGLAS Q	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2624	DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/783,889	RAMACHANDRAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Douglas Q. Tran	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 2/14/01 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

For at least claims 1,11, and 17, the limitation of “ ...examining said specification to determine a number of resources to generate each of said plurality of approaches” (emphasis added) renders the claims to be indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Because, the limitations from the first and fourth paragraph of “ implementing a plurality of approaches, ...” and “ selecting one of said plurality of approaches ...”, respectively, are already defined that the plurality of approaches locates within the system. Why each of said plurality of approaches needs to be generated after examining the specification; and lines 10-12 in page 9 of the specification also describes that using either back end screening approach or integrated screening. Thus, the specification does not describe how to generate each of the plurality of approaches, but just using the either one. Appropriate correction is required.

However, for prior art proposes, the claims are interpreted in accordance with the specification as indicated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1- 5, 10-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davidson et al. (US Patent No. 6,437,872 B1).

As to claim 1, Davidson teaches a method of generating an image using raster image processing, said image being generated based on a specification (i.e., PDL) specifying said image, said specification containing data representing a plurality of objects (col. 5, lines 60-63), said method comprising:

implementing a plurality of approaches (S445, S460 and S470 in fig. 4), with each approach being designed to generate said image (col. 6, lines 18-19; it is noted that the new image is generated after each processing);

receiving said specification (i.e., PDL from a step S420 in fig. 4);
examining said specification to determine a number of resources required to generate each of said plurality of approaches (steps S445, S460, S470 in fig. 4 indicates processing functions based on each of conditions of resources from S440, S455 and S465; col. 6, lines 16-19);

selecting one of said plurality of approaches which requires an optimal number of resources (from fig. 4, S445 is selected based on a condition of resource in S440 or S460 is

selected based on a condition of resource in S455 and S470b is selected based on a condition of resource in S465, col. 6, lines 25-34);

generating said image from said specification using said selected one of said plurality of approaches (S460 or S475 indicates that output page would contain the generated image).

As to claim 2, Davidson discloses every feature discussed in claim 1, and further teaches of said plurality of approaches differ at least in one of rendering and screening, wherein said rendering and screening are contained in said raster image processing (the process in S460 and the process in S470, S475 are different because S460 just renders the object and S470 and S475 has two functions of rendering and screening).

As to claim 3, Davidson discloses every feature discussed in claim 2, and further teaches said plurality of approaches comprises two approaches (the processes in S460 and S470 in fig. 4).

As to claim 4, Davidson discloses every feature discussed in claim 3, and further teaches said screening is performed using a back-end screening in a first one of said plurality of approaches and using pipelined screening in a second one of said plurality of approaches, wherein said rendering is implemented consistent with said back-end screening in said first approach and with said pipelined screening in said second approach (rendering steps S460 and S470 would be implemented consistent with two approaches for fully toned object in S455 and for partial toned object in S465 in fig. 4; and

it is noted that the limitations of the back end screening approach and the pipelined screening are not defined in this claim, thus the examiner considers these approaches that

broadly are only two different type of functions each for processing each of two different image data from the PDL).

As to claim 5, Davidson discloses every feature discussed in claim 4, and further teaches said examining comprises determining a minimum duration of time consumed by either said back-end screening or said pipelined screening (col. 4, lines 11-13 describes that any suitable screening rate can be selected for processing objects. Thus, it would be understood that the minimum duration of time is determined by consuming from either of screening).

As to claim 10, Davidson discloses every feature discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the specification is provides in a page description language (PDL is indicated in step of S425 in fig. 4).

As to claims 11-15, Davidson teaches the means or functions for performing the steps from claims 1-5 as indicated above.

As to claim 16, Davidson teaches every feature discussed in claim 1, and further the system comprises a computer system (col. 9, lines 14-15 describes that the processes are readily implement in a display system which would be considered as the computer system).

As to claims 17-21, Davidson teaches the a computer product for use with a computer system, said computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means (col. 8, line 63 to col. 9, line 5) for performing the steps from claims 1-5 as indicated above.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 6-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 1, but would be allowable if the rejected base claim 1 rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and if rewritten in independent form ***including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.***

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas Q. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4857 or E-mail address is douglas.tran@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Douglas Q. Tran
Aug. 12, 2004

Douglas Q. Tran